## JOSEPH T. VAN LEEUWEN

ATTORNEY AT LAW
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY

6123 PEBBLE GARDEN CT.
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78739

TELEPHONE: (512) 301-6738
FACSIMILE: (512) 301-6742
jvl@austin.rr.com

# Fax

**To:** EXAMINER LU

**From:** Joseph T. Van Leeuwen

**Fax:** 703-746-9694

**Pages:** _____ (including this page)

**Phone:** 703-305-4894

**Date:** _____

**Re:** 09/895,891 Agenda

**CC:** _____

☐ Urgent    ☐ For Review    ☐ Please Comment    ☐ Please Reply    ☐ Please Recycle

● **Comments:**

See Attached.

I tried to Email This to

You Yesterday but the Mail

Was Returned By USPTO's

Mail Server.

Thanks.

Joe

## Joseph Van Leeuwen

**From:** Joseph Van Leeuwen [jvl@austin.rr.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, February 22, 2004 7:53 PM

**To:** 'klu@uspto.gov'

**Subject:** 09/895,891 - Interview Agenda

Examiner Lu:

I have reviewed the relevant portions of the art cited (Oracle manual by Cafolla et al.) and would like to discuss my interpretation of the art with you.
Also, my copy of Cafolla that I received from the PTO is missing page 2-38, all other cited pages were present in the copy that I received. Would you mind faxing me a copy of page 2-38 so that I can review it? Thanks. My fax number is listed at the bottom of this note.

I would like to discuss the rejection of Claim 1. In particular, Cafolla does not seem to be teaching the "exclusion" of one or more employees from one view (the first view) to the second view, as claimed by Applicants.

Regarding claim 1, my reading of Cafolla is as follows:

1.  page 13-2 cited in the Office Action as teaching the selection of people from a first view to exclude in a second view. The cited section of Cafolla allows a user to select a viewed person in order to view more information about the selected person. It does not select people from one view to exclude in a second view.
2.  page 13-3 and 8-8 in the Office Action as teaching "excluding the employee profile information... resulting in a second view" My reading of this section of Cafolla is that Cafolla allows the user to select certain fields to be displayed in a second view, but does not allow the exclusion of certain employees from the second view. This reading of Cafolla is consistent on both pages 13-3 and 8-8.
3.  page 34-15 of Cafolla is cited in the Office Action as teaching "granting view access to the second view..." While 34-15 does teach the granting of permissions, it does not teach that permissions are granted to any views that resulted from the preceding cited steps identified in paragraphs 1 & 2, above. Rather, 34-15 simply states that permissions are granted on "secure views of those tables." Furthermore, I did not see that the above-cited sections of Cafolla taught the creation of any "secured views" Rather, the above sections allow a user to "drill down" into an employee's record to view various fields pertaining to the employee, without creating a "secured view" of the employee.

I would like to discuss your interpretation of Cafolla and, in particular, understand why you felt that Cafolla taught the "exclusion" of employees from a first view to a second view, as taught by Applicants. My overall impression is that Cafolla allows the user to drill down and exclude or include certain fields that he/she would like to view regarding an employee, but does not allow the user to create a "secure view" (term used by Cafolla) based upon one view that excludes employees from appearing in a second secured view.

Thanks,
Joe

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
ph. (512) 301-6738
fax (512) 301-6742